

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JAMES JOHNSON,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-2579 LKK JFM P

12 vs.

13 M. JIMINEZ, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On September 21, 2005, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment
17 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56. Plaintiff has not opposed the motion.

18 Local Rule 78-230(m) provides in part: "Failure of the responding party to file
19 written opposition or to file a statement of no opposition may be deemed a waiver of any
20 opposition to the granting of the motion" On May 19, 2004, plaintiff was advised of the
21 requirements for filing an opposition to the motion and that failure to oppose such a motion may
22 be deemed a waiver of opposition to the motion.

23 Local Rule 11-110 provides that failure to comply with the Local Rules "may be
24 grounds for imposition of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the
25 inherent power of the Court." In the order filed May 19, 2004, plaintiff was advised that failure
26 to comply with the Local Rules may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed.

1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, within thirty days of the
2 date of this order, plaintiff shall file an opposition, if any he has, to the motion to dismiss or a
3 statement of non-opposition. Failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation
4 that this action be dismissed pursuant Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).

5 DATED: October 25, 2005.

6
7 
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 john2579.46osc
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26